1. Overall structure and framing of SF-MST

Key questions for consideration

1.1. Does the introduction provide appropriate context and explanation of the role of the SF-MST? Are there other topics and issues that should be included in the introduction? Is the structure/logic of the introduction appropriate?

The introduction provides a very appropriate context for the measurement of sustainable tourism, however, it is recommended to provide a more in-depth explanation of the role of SF-MST within all that contextual and reference framework that is mentioned throughout the introduction.

1.2. Are you happy with the conceptual framing of the SF-MST using a multiple capitals-based approach to the organisation of data on the different dimensions of tourism activity?

Yes, we are satisfied, because although we must see the sustainability of tourism as a single activity in which the different dimensions of tourism activity converge, the measurement of each of them is different, even from the definitions and basic concepts that are handled they are special of each dimension.

1.3. Across chapters 2, 3 and 4 covering the economic, environmental and social dimensions, are there significant missing topics or themes?

Considering that the SF-MST does not intend to repeat the RIET and the CST: RMC, in chapter number 2 it would be advisable not to focus so much on manuals related to CST. Likewise, in this chapter it could be added that the identification of tourist establishments with ecotourism operations can be done through the use of geographic maps, which could allow us to locate those establishments that are close to the Protected Natural Areas and make them production account. Regarding employment, we consider it appropriate to include green jobs in Mexico's tourism activity in chapter 4.

Regarding chapter 3, it is intended that the measurement be made in physical units; however, as a complement, the measurement of monetary units can be suggested.

In relation to chapter 4, reference is made to employment, as in chapter 2; considering it appropriate to be included only in this chapter. Likewise, it would be possible to include the production accounts that Mexico produces in the archaeological zones and in other zones or places considered as Cultural Heritage. In terms of population groups, it is very difficult to have such disaggregated information and also relate it to tourism activity.

1.4. This draft includes a new chapter, chapter 6, on indicators and analysis. Is this inclusion appropriate?

We believe it is appropriate, however, that these combined tables can be completed as a result of the compilation of environmental information in Chapter 3.

1.5. Any other comments or questions on the overall coverage and structure of the draft SF-MST?

2. Employment aspects in measuring the sustainability of tourism

2.1. What are the key aspects concerning employment that are relevant in measuring the sustainability of tourism? You may wish to consider the *main issues identified by the*

sub-group on Employment as well as the individual contributions of three experts to the Working Group meeting on this topic:
- Canada
- Cardiff Business School
- GJASD International

Perhaps the most important and easy aspect to measure is decent employment linked to tourism activities.

2.2. What aspects of the concept of decent work are of most importance for policy and to what extent are they measurable?

2.3. In practice, what do you see as the main challenges in collecting additional detail on employment in tourism industries?

The main challenges are the need to have a job survey that at this level of detail and also, that allows you to associate it with the tourism industries.

3. Measuring the environmental sustainability of tourism

3.1. Does the chapter on the environment dimension cover all of the relevant areas for the measuring the environmental sustainability of tourism?

Yes, although Mexico considers that the quantification of animal species is very difficult to have at a national level and it is much more complex to determine the part that is for tourist activities.

3.2. Does the chapter appropriately describe the link between tourism activity and environmental assets?

Yes, it is described it, however, emphasis should be placed on accompanying the experts in environmental economic accounts to ensure success in this connection.

3.3. What role do you see for ecosystem accounting approaches in the SF-MST?

It would be an important role, having well-identified tourist regions and that these are mutually exclusive. In the case of Mexico, many tourist destinations converge with each other and are not mutually exclusive, making it very complex to establish specific allocations to the tourist activity without duplicating and / or omitting some geographical areas of the country. Likewise, it must be considered that ecosystem accounts are not additive, just as satellite accounts are not.

3.4. In practice, what do you see as the main challenges in collecting environmental data in relation to tourism activity?

The main challenge is the coordination with different institutions that generate environmental information and see in which units of measure they do it and under what temporality. In the case of Mexico, there are several institutions that collect environmental data and do so with different units of measure to those proposed in the SF-MST.

In the case of Mexico, the above is resolved through the creation of technical working groups, where all the institutions related to the sector are involved.

4. Measuring the social sustainability of tourism

4.1. Does the limited text describing the chapter on the social dimension cover all of the relevant approaches and aspects for the measuring the social sustainability of tourism? You may wish to consider the *main issues identified by the sub-group on the* social dimension: *"Statistical Tools to Measure Tourism from a Social Focus"* as well as the individual contributions of three experts to the Working Group meeting on this topic:
   - Argentina
   - Italy
   - Visit Flanders

4.2. What are the most important perspectives to consider in assessing the social dimension?

4.3. Establishing standard measures of social capital will be challenging in the short term. Is it sufficient for the SF-MST to focus on framing the measurement of the social dimension in terms of selected indicators?

4.4. In practice, what do you see as the main challenges in collecting social data in relation to tourism activity?

5. Defining spatial areas for tourism measurement

5.1. The SF-MST proposed 6 spatial scales from global to local levels. Is this appropriate and is the labelling of these levels suitable?

In general, we can say that levels are adequate; However, having information at all these levels is a pleasant challenge to face.

5.2. Are there particular themes that should be the focus of measurement at sub-national level?

Each country must define which level should be its focus, since it is often subject to political issues and depending on the government in turn.

5.3. The approach to defining spatial areas is based on establishing principles for measurement based on the idea of tourism concentrations. Is this an appropriate approach?

Yes, as long as tourist areas are well identified.

5.4. In practice, what do you see as the main challenges in collecting sub-national data in relation to tourism activity?

The challenges that Mexico identifies are budgetary to develop the projects, as well as the political aspects according to the government that is established in the country, as well as the interests of the rulers

6. MST connections to sustainable development indicators

6.1. Are the UN SDGs a good, useful or sufficient framing for determining a set of indicators on the sustainability of tourism?

We consider them as good indicators, however, we must also consider the existing information and that UMWTO issues its opinion regarding its construction.

Likewise, Mexico considers that they are sufficient and should go according to the development of the statistics of each country.

6.2. What are the priority themes for the development of indicators?

6.3. What are the main barriers to the collection of data to derive indicators and what needs to be put in place to support the use of indicators in decision making processes?

The main barriers are imposed by a political way in each of the countries, since based on the decisions of each acting government, it makes the budgetary allocation in the areas that they consider a priority.

7. Other comments

7.1. Do you have any other comments on the SF-MST at this stage?